Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/589,675	MURRAY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ahmed M. Farah	3735
All Participants:	Status of Application	ı:
(1) <u>Ahmed M. Farah</u> .	(3)	
(2) Peter J. Su (Reg. No. 43,949).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 18 January 2006	Time: <u>2:15 PM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	oplicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:	÷	
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sur	n. The examiner will provide a rate record of the substance (of the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	olicant/Applicant's Representat	tive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 09/589,675

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In the amendment filed on January 18, 2006, certain language in claim 10 was deleted. Applicant's representative put a line through the deleted subject matter. However, the faxed copy shows a partial line through the subject matter supposed to be deleted. Applicant's representative authorized the examiner to delete the remaining portion by Examiner's Amendment. See the attached Examiner's Amendment.